

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed May 9, 2008, claims 7-25 were subject to restriction and election. Claim 6 is currently withdrawn.

Election of Species

The Office Action identifies the following species corresponding to the figures of the present application:

<u>Species</u>	<u>Figure(s)</u>
1	1
2	2
3	3

Claims are often referred to as species claims and generic claims, depending on how the scope of each claim relates to the described embodiments which are identified in the application. If a claim has a scope that is limited to a single embodiment, then the claim is a species claim. MPEP 806.04(e). Otherwise, if a claim has a scope which encompasses two or more embodiments, then the claim is a generic or genus claim. Id. In other words, a generic or genus claim is not limited to a single embodiment. With specific reference to the limitations of a claim, a claim is defined as a generic claim if the claim requires no additional limitations over a species claim and each species requires all of the limitations of the generic claim. Genus, or generic, claims are one type of linking claim. MPEP 809. Linking claims must be examined with, and are thus considered part of, the invention elected. Id.

In the present Office Action, the Examiner states that currently no claim is generic. However, Applicants respectfully assert independent claims 7 and 20 are generic to all species because independent claims 7 and 20 are not limited to a single embodiment of the application. In particular, independent claims 7 and 20 do not recite limitations which would be additional to the indicated species shown in Figs. 1, 2, and 3. Additionally, each of independent claims 7 and 20 recites limitations which are present in all of the indicated species. Therefore, according to the requirements of MPEP

806.04(c), both of independent claims 7 and 20 should be considered generic linking claims for all of the species identified in the present Office Action.

Also, dependent claims 8-10, 15-19, and 21-24 recite limitations which are not limited to a single embodiment shown in the indicated species of Figs. 1, 2, and 3. Therefore, each of dependent claims 8-10, 15-19, and 21-24 should also be considered a generic linking claim for all of the species identified in the present application.

Furthermore, dependent claims 11, 14, and 25 recite limitations which are not limited to a single embodiment of either of the embodiments shown in the indicated species of Figs 2 and 3. Therefore, each of dependent claims 11, 14, and 25 should also be considered a generic linking claim for the indicated species corresponding to Figs. 2 and 3.

The following table identifies which species claims and generic linking claims correspond to each of the species indicated in the Office Action.

<u>Species</u>	<u>Species Claims</u>	<u>Generic Linking Claims</u>
1	N/A	7-10, 15-24
2	13	7-11, 14-25
3	12	7-11, 14-25

Applicants hereby elect Species 3, as identified by the Examiner, for prosecution on the merits. Claims 7-12 and 14-25 correspond to Species 3, as either applicable species or generic linking claims. According to the requirements of MPEP 809, the generic linking claims 7-11 and 14-25 must be examined with the species claim 12 and the elected species corresponding to Fig. 3.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request consideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-3444** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-3444** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: June 6, 2008

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111